VOLUME VIII NUMBER 3

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

JULY 1934

EDITORIAL

THE LARGEST AND MOST VIGOROUS DAUGHTER COLONY ESTABlished by emigration from the original Swiss and German Mennonite settlements in Eastern Pennsylvania was the settlement in Waterloo County, Ontario, Canada, which, with the smaller allied settlements in near by counties, for the past hundred and fifteen years has constituted the Ontario Mennonite Conference. In earlier times this group furnished one of the ablest leaders the Mennonite Church in North America has produced in the person of Bishop Benjamin Eby, the founder of the conference and its leader for the first forty years of its history. And in the present generation again the Ontario Mennonites have contributed in resources of leadership and spiritual life to the church at large far out of proportion to the size of their group. Somewhat aside from the main stream of American Mennonite life, and living in a "foreign" country, their development has not always paralleled that of the Mennonite Conferences located in the United States. A history of this section of the Mennonite Church has long been eagerly awaited, and has at last been announced as an official publication of the Ontario Conference to appear in the spring of 1935. The REVIEW is fortunate to be able to publish a portion of the manuscript in advance of its appearance in book form. The author, L. J. Burkholder of Markham, Ontario, is himself a direct descendant of one of the early immigrant families and has been for almost forty years an active ministerial member of the Ontario Conference.

In the last issue of the Review John Horsch brought to a conclusion his valuable refutation of accusations of fanaticism and crime against the Swiss Brethren. To round out the picture of contemporary Reformation opinion of the Anabaptists he now presents very interesting evidence that the enemies and calumniators of the Anabaptists were frequently compelled to admit that the personal piety and character of those whom they so bitterly attacked was above reproach, and was consistently on a much higher level of Christian living than that of the members of the state churches. Almost beyond belief is the evidence that men were at times compelled to indulge in sin and vice to avoid the suffering and persecution which would come upon them if they should be thought to belong to the Anabaptist group because of an exemplary life.

Books Reviewed in This Issue:

John W. Graham: *Conscription and Conscience,* A History, 1916-1919. London, 1922. By Edward Yoder.

Reinhold Niebuhr: *Moral Man and Immoral Society,* New York, 1932. By Edward Yoder.

Ethelbert Stauffer: *Märtyrertheologie und Täuferbewegung,* an article in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,* Stuttgart, 1933. By Ernst Correll.

THE EARLY MENNONITE SETTLEMENTS IN ONTARIO

L. J. Burkholder

INTRODUCTION

The older portion of the province of Ontario includes that area of land lying north of Lake Erie and Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River, east of Lake Huron, and south of Lake Nipissing and the Ottawa River, comprising more than 400,000 square miles. The surface is generally undulating and rises in the north to an altitude of 1,200 feet above the sea level. The soil is greatly diversified. The climate is generally pleasant and healthful. Extremes are modified by a dry clear atmosphere, and in the southwest by extensive adjoining waters. The average rainfall is about twenty-three inches and snowfall fifty-two. Agriculture is the leading industry. Fruit farming is successfully pursued in the southwest and in the Niagara peninsula.

First among the early explorers was the Frenchman, Champlain who came in 1615 and who visited Lakes Ontario and Nipissing. Fur traders visited Lake Superior in 1660. Niagara was founded by LaSalle in 1679. Toronto was founded as York in 1749. The territory now called Ontario originally formed a part of Quebec. It became a separate territory in 1791 under the name of Upper Canada, Quebec being then also called Lower Canada. By the Act of Union in 1841, Upper Canada became one of two provinces in Canada. In 1867 under the British North America Act it became a separate province known as Ontario and entered the Confederation with Quebec, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia, these four original provinces forming the Dominion of Canada.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century the sparsely settled areas were found chiefly along the St. Lawrence and the shores of the Great Lakes. Groups of Iroquois, Huron, and Six Nations Indians were numerous in the interior. Following the War of the American Revolution, lands in many of the recently surveyed townships were granted to English officers who had fought in the War and were not satisfied to continue residence in the United States. These lands were given as reward for their loyalty. They were situated largely in the Niagara peninsula, in the so-called Home District, near Kingston.

Lord Dorchester had divided the province of Upper Canada into four districts. The German names given to these districts were intended to flatter the Hanoverian King of England. Lunenburg lay between the Ottawa River and Gananoque; Mecklenburg extended from Gananoque to the Trent River; Nassau was the region extending from the Trent to Long Point on Lake Erie; and Hesse included the remainder of Upper Canada, west to the St. Clair River and Lake Huron. Each district was given a judge and a sheriff. General John Graves Simcoe, the first Lieutenant-Governor of Upper Canada, arrived at his post of duty in July, 1792. The capital of the new colony was at first Newark (Niagara on the Lake). Here Governor Simcoe built a small frame dwelling which also served as the place of meeting for the first parliament of Upper Canada. At this time the names of the four districts were changed to Eastern, Midland, Home or Niagara, and the Western or Detroit District respectively.

In 1783 large numbers of United Empire Loyalists had flocked to Canada from the United States. The earliest ones went to Nova Scotia. The principal centres around which these immigrants located, however, were in Upper Canada—at Kingston, York (Toronto), and along the Niagara River. It has been estimated that nearly 50,000 came to Canada between 1783-86. The Loyalists who applied for land grants in Canada at this time were required to prove that they had been attached to the British cause and had suffered, as a consequence, the loss of property, and other abuses. The claim was accepted as valid when supported by a single witness. The grants were made very generously. Governor Simcoe (November 6, 1794) made even more generous offers to attract a class of desirable settlers.[1] The immigrant would receive 200 acres of land and some other assistance. He must profess the Christian religion, and he must have a good reputation in the country from which he came. In the first year of his regime Simcoe had advised the British consul in Philadelphia that Quakers and like societies should be admitted from Pennsylvania, and would be accorded exemption from bearing arms as had been allowed hitherto by the British government. These inducements from Simcoe and the desire to be under the English king (as will be shown later) caused numerous Mennonite families from Pennsylvania to migrate to the fertile wilderness lands in the Home District and along the Grand River. Possibly the difficulty of securing cheap land in the thickly

[1] Simcoe's Papers, Vol. III, p. 172.

populated settlements in the older Mennonite communities of Eastern Pennsylvania also played a part in the movement.

The lands acquired by the Mennonites were not usually Crown lands. The greater number of the Mennonites were prepared to pay a fair purchase price for farms which in some instances were partly improved. In the settlements at Markham, at "the Twenty," and in Welland county the lands bought by the Mennonites had been owned by officers and men who had served in the English army. See for instance Haldimand's grants to officers in the townships adjoining Kingston and also Col. Lippincott's holdings in Vaughan township, York county.

The lands in the beautiful upper Grand River basin in what is now Waterloo County were a part of the six blocks that had been ceded to the Six Nations Indians. Block 2, agreeing nearly with the present bounds of Waterloo Township and comprising 94,012 acres, had been bought from the Indians by one Richard Beasley. This purchase was secured by a mortgage, executed May 10, 1798, for 8,887 pounds, the whole of the purchase price. Five years later only 600 pounds had been paid by the purchaser to the trustees for the Indians. The Mennonite immigrants bought their lands from Mr. Beasley in 1800 and the years following. It was in January, 1803, that they discovered that their land title was not "free from encumberance." They were in "danger of loosing their land."[2] Later in the same year, 1803, through the assistance of brethren in Pennsylvania they were able to enter into an agreement with Mr. Beasley for the purchase of 60,000 acres. By this deal the mortgage was paid and the settlers obtained a clear deed to all their holdings. The lands in the Grand River basin were well wooded and possessed natural drainage. The soil is inclined to be light along the river, but farther back it gradually becomes richer, changing to a very productive clay loam.

In the Niagara Peninsula the pioneers found heavy timber. The narrow strip of land lying between Lake Ontario and the escarpment is a warm, friable, productive loam. It is especially adapted to fruit-growing. Several creeks flow from the "mountain" through ravines, crossing this strip of land and emptying into the lake. These creeks are named according to the number of miles their course lies from the Niagara. The "Twenty Mile Creek" is the name of the stream flowing through the Mennonite settlement in Lincoln county near Jordan, which is approximately twenty miles

---

2 See Benjamin Eby's *Kurzgefasste Geschichte der Mennoniten-Gemeinden,* Berlin, (Ontario) 1841, p. 155.

from the Niagara River. For this reason the settlement was long called "The Twenty." That portion of the peninsula lying above the escarpment was formerly very heavily wooded and has a heavy clay soil. The first Mennonite settlers to come to Canada crossed the Niagara River and followed the Chippewa Creek and the Black Creek inland from the Niagara. Others followed the north shore of Lake Erie westward. Evidently the Niagara area was chosen because it was the most accessible portion of Canada for the Pennsylvania settlers.

The Markham settlement in York County about twenty miles northeast of Toronto began when the settlers in Waterloo found the flaw in the land titles in 1803. From the "Head of the Lake" (Hamilton) it was only a little farther to York (Toronto) than to the Grand River. The township of Markham had been surveyed about ten years earlier and the indomitable William Berczy had recently led more than sixty families into this region and formed the German Mills settlement in the western part of Markham, along the Nen (Rouge) River.

The early settlers who blazed the trail into our present well-tilled communities found an almost impenetrable forest without roads or bridges. Fish and game were abundant. The axe and the ox-team were the means of subduing the woodland. With courage and faith in God they faced the task. Niagara, Dundas, and York were the three primitive towns from which they obtained their sugar, tea and other necessities. Wheat was carried on horseback or on foot many miles to the nearest grist-mill. Untold hardships were endured in those early days.

It is estimated that at least five thousand Mennonite immigrants came from Germany and Switzerland to Pennsylvania from 1683 to 1750. With few exceptions all of these were of Swiss stock. Some of them had fled from the Swiss cantons to the Palatinate along the upper Rhine, 1650-1700, where they had enjoyed temporary relief from persecution, and from whence they came to the New World. Others came directly from Switzerland to Pennsylvania. The settlement prospered in the new land. In their new home, the forests were subdued, land was tilled and bountiful harvests were gathered. They enjoyed religious liberty under the Quaker government of the province. Even after Penn and his associates ceased to control the affairs they were excused from military service and the swearing of oaths. This exemption was by the authority of enactments of the British Parliament. In 1749 the London Government granted such exemptions to the Moravians

throughout the British Empire. Undoubtedly this privilege was also accorded to the Mennonites and Quakers.

With Germantown as a nucleus the Mennonite colony in Pennsylvania made rapid strides. From 1709 to 1740 the number of immigrants multiplied rapidly each succeeding year. The Skippack settlement in Montgomery County after 1702 and the Pequea settlement in Lancaster County after 1710 absorbed the new-comers of these early years. The adjoining counties of Chester, Bucks, Lehigh, Northampton, Berks, Lebanon, York, Dauphin and Adams also received some of the immigrants, as well as many second generation settlers. The ministers were diligent to follow their people into the wilderness homes and organize them into congregations. Among the first ministers in Skippack are found the names of Rittenhouse, Godschalk, Kolb, Ziegler, Funck and Bechtel. In Lancaster the names of Herr, Hershey, Brackbill, Shantz, Burkholder and Hostetler appear.

The first minister in America was William Ruddinghysen (Rittenhouse). He came to Germantown in 1688. The first Mennonite meeting house was built in Germantown in 1708. It was rebuilt in 1770, and is the oldest Mennonite meetinghouse in America still in use. The first paper mill in America was built by preacher William Rittenhouse in 1690, near Germantown. The first treatise in America on pedagogy was written in 1750 by Christopher Dock, a Mennonite schoolteacher at Skippack, but, at his request, was not printed until 1770. In 1688, a Mennonite joined with several Quakers to send a protest against slavery to the Friends' Quarterly Meeting. This was the first public protest against this iniquitous traffic.

The land holdings of these early settlers usually ran into the hundreds of acres each. With four and five hundred acres in a farm it soon became difficult to provide a farm for every son as he came to the age when he wished to settle in his own home. The better quality of land had been selected. Good land was relatively expensive, and in the early part of the nineteenth century, sold for more than $100.00 per acre in the older settlements. The population pressure was one of the reasons for the move to Canada.

But there were other reasons. History repeats itself. Since the founding of the Swiss Brethren (Mennonite) group in Switzerland in 1525, they and their descendants had frequently moved from one land to another. They very literally followed the Master's word, "If they persecute you in one city, flee to another." To escape persecution they left their homes in Switzerland, 1650-1700,

to seek relief in the Palatinate. After 1700 many from both Switzerland and the Palatinate gladly took advantage of the opportunity to enjoy religious freedom in the Province of Pennsylvania under the British Crown. That they enjoyed this privilege until the time of the Revolutionary War is generally conceded.

However, when the colonies declared their independence from England the Mennonites found themselves embarrassed. Because of their non-resistant principles they had no sympathy with the revolutionists. To rise against constituted authority, and especially against the government that had respected their conscientious scruples, was considered exceedingly wrong. Naturally, they sympathized with the loyalists. There was of course no patriotic love in any sense for England. On the other hand, to show friendliness toward the English brought them into conflict with the revolutionary party. To sympathize with England and not rally to her defense in time of revolution brought the wrath of English militarists upon them. It was a very troublesome situation. C. H. Smith says, "At the same time, too, there were those not in sympathy with the separation from the English Crown. The period of anarchy following the close of the war did not strengthen the confidence of these people in the new government. To all of these the large tracts of cheap land in Ontario (Upper Canada), not far from the American (U. S.) line, seemed to offer an opportunity for bettering their material condition and at the same time remaining under the rule of the English king."[3] When the war was concluded and the colonies had gained their independence a new system of government was established. It became a question whether the same religious liberty would be enjoyed by the Mennonites. A period of confusion and uncertainty followed the war and their misgivings increased.

The Mennonites were not United Empire Loyalists, yet they naturally favored the government that had given them religious freedom and their residence of nearly a century in America strengthened their confidence in British institutions. When not actually expelled from the United States, the Loyalists were social outcasts. They could neither vote nor hold land . . . or keep arms, or serve on a jury, be a lawyer, physician, or schoolmaster.[4] "Charles Lynch of Virginia led in punishing the Loyalists by lynching."[5] "Edward Winslow of Boston was exiled and received every species of insult and abuse which the utmost rancour and malice could invent.

[3] C. H. Smith, *The Mennonites,* Berne, Indiana, 1920, p. 229.
[4] Public School History of Toronto, p. 180.
[5] *Op. cit.,* p. 157.

Britain pleaded for toleration, but feeling in the United States was too bitter, and an orgy of cruelty broke out among the victors. Men and women were imprisoned, whipped, tarred and feathered. Many were hanged."[6] It should not be assumed that this same cruelty was laid upon the Mennonites generally. They were classed as Non-Associators because they did not lend active aid to the Revolution. Because of the unfair treatment accorded to the Non-Associators by the revolutionary party, says the late H. A. Reesor, Toronto barrister, due to their failure to take part in the war, they decided to move to Canada.

In the History of Waterloo Township by Ezra Eby the following appears (page 18): "Although these people did not take part on either side of politics, yet their sympathies leaned toward the Crown during the Revolutionary War, and immediately after peace was restored and the independence of the thirteen colonies declared, hundreds of these people, and others called United Empire Loyalists, left their homes and property in the new Republic and travelled to British territory, to the north of the lakes and the river St. Lawrence. The cause of this may have been the great faith they had that the British Government would fulfil the promise, made to them over a hundred years previously, of granting them exemption from military service and from taking oaths. All these things had a tendency to give them attachments to the countries ruled by Britain, and finally may have been the principal cause of their settling in Canada." M. G. Sherk says his grandsire "left (1798) Lancaster County in Pennsylvania on account of persecution, . . . the revolutionists burning his home because he sympathised with the British, . . ."[7] Mr. W. H. Breithaupt advances the same motive for the Mennonite movement to Canada.[8] "In the history of the Mennonites, love of order and of liberty, and freedom to follow their religious tenets, one of these being their opposition to carrying arms in war, have always been distinguishing characteristics. It was this that impelled them to cross the ocean to accept the offer of William Penn to settle on his lands in Pennsylvania. The same motive, combined with a want to get back to stable government, was the motive that brought many of them to Upper Canada. They distrusted the new experiment in government and the turmoil of petty wars which continued in Pennsylvania after the close of the American Revolution. Indian wars created disturbances, and

---

[6] H. S. History, p. 143.

[7] M. G. Sherk, *Reminiscences of the Upper Road*, p. 6.

[8] *First Settlements, etc.*, p. 1.

in 1794 there broke out in the western counties of the state, what was known as the Whiskey Insurrection, which threatened the overthrow of what order there had been established. The British territory to the north had the attraction of stable government under accustomed authority and the promise of complete freedom to follow their own religious ideas. When, added to this, reports came back from the pioneers of a fertile country and fine climate, the desire to emigrate became still stronger."

The Mennonites, soon after they first landed in America, became naturalized British subjects in 1691 and the following years. They affirmed allegiance to the British Crown when being naturalized. "A positive link uniting them to the royal cause was the Promise of Allegiance they had taken when they became citizens. This solemn promise had great weight among them; to break it was an extremely serious thing."[9]

David Sherk, a Mennonite minister in Waterloo and son of the first settler, Joseph Sherk, who was born in 1801, the year after his parents arrived, says, relative to the motive for the migration, "But those living under the English government enjoying unrestricted freedom of conscience, others became favorably inclined toward the government, and this in connection with other causes induced some of them to emigrate in the years 1799 and 1800, to Canada into an entire wilderness."[10]

In addition to the above testimony there are many individuals, descendants of these early immigrants, who agree that the fathers came to Canada chiefly because of their confidence that under British rule they would be able to follow their religious convictions and enjoy exemption from military service. This, then, is taken as the primary reason for the migration. Among the secondary reasons should be noted the increased density of the population in the better farming areas in Pennsylvania, the high price of farms, and the severe depression and crop failures. It was difficult to find enough farming land in the older settlements to provide homes for the younger families. Land in 1819 sold for as much as $150 per acre.[11] Ezra Eby says: "Financial depression from 1816-1827 caused many farmers in Montgomery county to fail; and in order to save themselves from losing money the distressed farmers sold their farms and paid their debts, and with the small balance left, they wended

---

[9] Wilbur J. Bender, "Pacifism in Pennsylvania," in *Mennonite Quarterly Review* for 1927, Vol. I, p. 21.

[10] From a letter by David Sherk to a Mennonite in Germany printed without title or place in 1863, p. 5.

[11] Letter of Samuel Weaver to Jacob Schmitt of Vaughan, Mrs. B. Diller.

their way to Canada where land could be obtained cheap, and thus made another attempt to gain a free home."[12]

It is not possible to determine definitely how many Mennonite families came from Pennsylvania to Upper Canada. We do know at least 184 family names are to be found throughout the several Mennonite colonies. If on the average three baptized and communicant church members to the family are allowed a total church membership of 552 immigrants will be arrived at. Since many younger children were found in the groups, it is a fair estimate when we say that the Mennonite immigrant population reached a total of about 800 or 1000 souls. However, many of the family names were represented by more than one immigrant family, so that the above estimate is certainly conservative.

The Ecclesiastical Chart of Upper Canada for the year 1828, gives the number of Mennonite church members as 1,164 and the hearers as 2,388. This would seem too high. Practically all the original immigrants had arrived by this time.

The usual mode of travel from Pennsylvania to Canada was with the four-horse covered wagon. These wagons came to be called "Conestoga Wagons." It was common for the more robust persons to walk since the wagons were heavily loaded. Each family usually brought a cow with them. The cows were also shod and driven after the wagons. The milk that remained from the daily needs, was put into the churn which was suspended from the wagon. Usually at the end of the day's journey the butter was ready for use. The tar bucket, used for lubricating the wagon axles, was hung under the wagon. Frequently the wagons had to be dismantled, and everything was carried piece by piece across the mire or over the mountain. The wagon-box was sometimes used as a boat to cross the streams. Parties required as much as seven weeks to make the whole journey. The party that came to "the Twenty" in 1800 consisted of eleven four-horse teams, and there were sixty persons in the company. One evening as they camped for the night, a tree fell and killed three horses. On the same trip one of the wagons broke and the company had to halt for repairs. Sometimes the wagons upset and everything was thrown into the mud. The Allegheny Mountains were the chief barrier. The immigrants endured untold hardships, but they sought not only material but spiritual gain.

It is probable that these immigrants had never renounced their allegiance to Britain. Their fathers had become British subjects when they affirmed loyalty to the Crown as they arrived in America.

---

12 Eby's History as above, Vol. I, p. 752.

On that basis the Mennonite settlers who came to Canada would have had no customs or immigration difficulty at the border. There has been found, however, one instance where official permission to enter was given to a settler at Fort Erie.

When the settlers reached their destination, they usually made a small clearing in the woods. With the trees which they felled a small log house was erected in which they set up a new home in the forest. The house had two rooms with an open fireplace in the one gable end. This took the place of our present day range and furnace. The spinning wheel and the hand weaving loom were brought into play and the homespun cloth provided clothing for the family. The wool and flax were produced on their own land and it was spun, woven and tailored in the home. The skins from their own cattle were tanned into leather and the shoemaker came to the home and made up footwear for the entire family. They often travelled many miles on horseback to the mill with a sack of wheat to have it ground into flour. The bread was baked in a baking kettle which was placed in the fireplace and covered with live coals. Before the days of matches they obtained "fire" with flint, steel and punk. When the fire went out they would often go to the neighbors for fire. The homemade "fat lamp" gave light before the tallow candle was used.

It was common to find in each colony persons who were capable of working in the ordinary trades. They usually built saw mills and grist mills, hemp mills and lime-kilns at a very early date. In every settlement places of worship were provided soon after the settlers arrived. At first they gathered in the residences, and a little later they built houses of worship. The Mennonites were usually pioneers in the community in providing schools for their children. Long before the public school was organized, the families of the community built a log school house and engaged a teacher. This custom they brought with them from Pennsylvania. The teacher was hired on the basis of a certain sum for each pupil. He received free board among the families in regular turn. It was common in the early days, when land was conveyed for a church, to designate that it be used for school purposes, also.

The Lincoln County Settlement at the "Twenty"

The pioneer Mennonites in Ontario were found in three main settlements—the Lincoln County or Niagara district, the Waterloo County district, and the York County or Markham district. The colony at the "Twenty," in the Niagara district was the earliest to arrive. [The locality was commonly called Twenty, because the

Twenty Mile Creek flows through this settlement, and this stream is so named because it runs parallel with the Niagara and is about twenty miles to the west, as mentioned earlier.]

In W. H. Davis' *History of Bucks County, Pennsylvania,*[13] there is an account of what appears to have been the beginning of emigration from Pennsylvania to Upper Canada. Davis gives the names of six families who came to "the Twenty" in 1786. They were John, Dilman, Jacob, and Stoffel (Christophel) Kulp, also spelled Kolb and Culp, Franklin Albright, and Fredrick Hahn. Davis does not mention the religious affiliation of these families. It has been questioned by persons of our day whether these families ever were Mennonite, or whether, if they were, they became identified with the church at "the Twenty." There is no trace of this first group in the organized Mennonite church life of later years. That this first group came just three years after the Peace of Paris which concluded the struggle between the American colonies and Britain, helps to confirm the view that British laws and British religious liberty attracted these settlers. The next groups came in the years 1799, 1800 and 1801. It is certain that they were all of the Mennonite faith. Davis' history gives names of at least thirty-three families who left Bucks County and arrived in Lincoln County, Ontario, up to the year 1802. The settlers locating about Jordan and Campden came generally from Bucks County, Pennsylvania.

It was to the ministers of the Deep Run Mennonite Church in Bedminster Township in Bucks County, that this little colony appealed for ministerial help during the summer of 1801. A letter in reply signed by six ministers was sent to this flock without a shepherd in the fall of the same year. The letter gave directions for the choosing of a minister. In accord with instructions a minister and a deacon were chosen in the autumn of 1801. This colony could easily have numbered sixty or more church members in 1801 with a total of more than a hundred souls including children.

The overflow from this settlement drifted chiefly into Haldimand County near Dunnville. The Cayuga congregation established about 1835 was a scion from "Twenty." This migration took place when the next generation began to look for land to establish new homes. Several families from the "Twenty" also moved west and settled in the township of Bayham in Elgin County. A few were church members and they retained their fellowship with

[13] W. H. Davis, *History of Bucks County, Pennsylvania.*

the church at the "Twenty." However no congregation ever developed at this latter place.

A few more details regarding the founding of "the Twenty" colony might be interesting. "During the summer of 1799 Amos Albright, Abraham Meyer and Jacob Meyer travelled on foot from Hilltown, Pennsylvania, to the Niagara district in Upper Canada, on a prospecting tour. They were so well pleased with the country that, before returning, they purchased 1100 acres of land. For a portion of it lying along the Indian trail, [now Highway No. 2] the price was $2.50 per acre, and for the remainder lying nearer the lake, $1.50 per acre. A deposit of $40.00 secured them the purchase; and they then walked back to their Pennsylvania homes. The same autumn they removed to the new land of promise with all their portable belongings."[14]

While the English Government offered free lands and other assistance to settlers of this type, yet the Mennonites were usually prepared to pay for their lands. They usually bought from a soldier or a United Empire Loyalist who was eager to turn a part of his large holding into cash. A few of the farms had small clearings and buildings.

The "Twenty" settlement was composed of representatives of at least nineteen family names, among which are the following: Culp, Albright, Fretz, Overholt, Hoch, Moyer, Wismer, Nash, Kratz, Althouse, Hunsberger, Housser, Grobb, Rittenhouse, Hahn, Hipple, Martin, Swartz, Gehman, Seivenpipher.

The routes which the immigrants followed to their new homes usually were along some water course. From Lancaster County and the adjacent westerly counties a rather clearly defined course led from Harrisburg along the Susquehanna River to Blossburg in Tioga County then into New York State and via Batavia, Clarence, Buffalo, and Niagara Falls to the Twenty.[15] The earliest route from the Falls to the Twenty was along the lake shore. Most of the streams had been bridged at this early date. There was a ferry operating at Black Rock as early as 1783. In Pennsylvania and western New York the mountain ridges and also the water courses run principally from the southeast to the northwest. This was an aid in coming to Canada. This may have been a secondary reason for the emigrants choosing Canada rather than Ohio where

---

14 *Moyer Family History,* p. 328.

15 For outline in detail of actual routes followed by early travelers see Harold S. Bender, "New Source Material for the History of the Mennonites of Ontario," in *Mennonite Quarterly Review,* Vol. III, 1929, pp. 46-49.

the mountains would have to be crossed. There were fewer mountain barriers en route to Canada. From the eastern counties of Bucks, Montgomery, Northampton, and Lehigh the route led more directly north through Binghampton and Canandaigua to Buffalo.

The Welland County Settlement

The Mennonite families who came into the settlement in Welland County arrived about the time of the coming of those who located at the Twenty, or possibly in a few cases a few years earlier. It is probable that they came chiefly from Lancaster County and the adjoining counties of York and Chester. We know that several families came from Lancaster. As early as 1793 there were nearly a hundred families resident at Sugar Loaf (Sherkston area) about 15 miles west from Fort Erie and Buffalo. The family names indicate that they were Quaker and Mennonite. They petitioned the Government to make a survey of their lands to avoid difficulties of limits and encroachments. The grant of land made to Jacob Sevits in 1797 shows that he came in 1788.[16] This is the earliest known record of a Mennonite family coming to Upper Canada. In 1796 eight townships, lying west and north of Fort Erie, were opened to settlers. Much of this area was given to Loyalist soldiers as reward for their loyalty. These in turn broke up their large tracts and made sale to families who sought homesteads in the wilds of Canada. Abraham Neaf obtained a grant of land in 1794 and Benjamin Hersche from Lancaster came in 1795. The Mennonite families spread into Bertie and Humberstone townships along Lake Erie, and Willoughby township to the north along the Niagara River. The settlement was also known as "Black Creek" because of the stream by that name which flows through Bertie and empties into the Niagara. There were at least three regular places of worship used by the Mennonites in their early days: one at Bertie, near Sherkston, one near Stevensville, and the one along the river in Willoughby, known as the Miller church. The following are some of the family names of these pioneers: Sailer (Saylor), Morningstar, Beam, Waggoner, Shoup, Boyer, Barnhart, Flag, Neigh, Rickhart, Werner, Baker, Lapp, Miller, Danner, Whisler, Sherk, Herschey, Zavitz (also spelled Tewits, Sevits, and Zewitz), Storms, Zimmerman, Winger, Bears, Fretz, Learn, Knisley, Neff, and Weaver. In some instances there was more than one family by the same name in the community.

---

16 Letters and Records, Ont. Hist. Soc.

The Cayuga Settlement in Haldimand County

When the second generation in the Niagara district began to look for lands upon which they might establish homes, the township of South Cayuga in Haldimand County offered attractions. At least two families, the Sherks and Werners, moved here from the Welland Colony. From the "Twenty" came the Culps, Hunsbergers, Frys, Gaymans, Moyers, Highs, Seivenpiphers. The Cayuga Hoovers came from the York county colony. This settlement was made between the years 1835 and 1840. Only one place of worship was used. This was a small frame building still standing about seven miles west from Dunnville, along the Rainham Road, at Frey's Corners.

The Rainham Settlement in Haldimand County

This small colony of Mennonites evidently sprung up independently of any other group in the province. It began when David Hoover of York County, Pennsylvania, came on horseback in 1791 on a prospecting tour. He was so well pleased with the prospects in this area that he purchased about 2,000 acres of land along Lake Erie, partly in Walpole township and partly in Rainham township, Haldimand County, situated between the present hamlets of Cheapside and Rainham Centre. He returned and the next year several of his sons came and made some clearing at what is now known as Hoover's Point, and prepared for the coming of other members of the family. In 1793 the family came and located on the lands which the father had previously secured. Five sons and three daughters settled on these lands. It is reported that they were the first white settlers in these townships. They travelled with wagons from their former home to Fort Erie, crossed the Niagara River by ferry and drove along the beach to their new home in the woods. Beside the Hoovers, we early find the family names of Shank, (a minister), Swartz, Strickler, Byers and Miller in the colony. The names Hess and Hare are found here at present but it is not known whether these descend from Mennonite ancestors. The Mennonite Church in this colony has never been large, chiefly because the number of original immigrants was small, also because the larger number of descendants has been absorbed by other churches.

The Waterloo Settlement

The Waterloo County settlement along the Grand River, about sixty-five miles north of Lake Ontario and seventy-five miles

northwest of the "Twenty" is by far the largest Mennonite colony in Ontario. About one hundred family names are found in the Waterloo settlement. The following families came from Lancaster County, Pennsylvania: Bauman, Block, Bock, Bricker, Brubacher, Burkhardt, Burkholder, Christner, Eby, Erb, Eschleman, Gingerich, Good, Groff, Hamacher, Heckedon, Hoffman, Horst, Huber, Keller, Kauffman, Martin, Meyer, Mosser, Reichert, Reist, Rudy, Schneider, Stauffer, Stoeckle, Strome, Unger, Wanner, Weber, Winger (Wenger), Witmer, Yost. The following are from Montgomery County, Pennsylvania: Bechtel, Biehn, Bingeman, Bliehm, Cassel, Clemmer, Detweiler, Gehman, Grody, Hagey, Hallman, Histand, Hunsberger, Oberholtzer, Pannebacker, Rosenberger, Schiedel, Swartz, Schantz, Shoemaker, Souder, Thoman, Wismer, Ziegler, Lichty. From Bucks County, Pennsylvania, came the Fried, Kolb, Haas, Kinzie, and Wideman families. The Koch, Musselman, Nahrgang, and Schmidt families came from Germany, Koch, Nahrgang, and Schmidt not being originally Mennonite, but Lutheran or Reformed.

The Brech (Break) family came from Dauphin County; Clemens from Chester; Cressman from Limerick Township; Bowers from Northumberland; Betzner, Schoerg (Sherk), and Schlichter from Franklin; Bear from York; Bauman (Bowman) and Latschaw (Latschar) from Berks.

Since several of the above named families consisted of a number of brothers or other relatives by the same name, it is fair to conclude that there were easily one hundred and twenty-five heads of families of Mennonites that moved into the Waterloo settlement between 1800 and 1825.

The very first settlers, Joseph Schoerg and Samuel Betzner, left their homes in Franklin County, Pennsylvania, in the fall of 1799 and travelled as far as the "Twenty" where they wintered. In the next spring, 1800, they, with their families, followed the Indian trail as far as Brantford, and thence went north along the Grand River and settled on its banks in what is Waterloo County. The location of their farms is now marked by the Waterloo Pioneers Memorial Tower erected in 1926, four miles south of Kitchener. These two families were the first white families to settle in what now is Waterloo County. During the early spring of the same year, 1800, according to Ezra Eby,[17] Samuel Betzner, Sr., and John and Christian Reichert, with their families, came from Lancaster County. David Gingerich of Lancaster County visited the

[17] Page 21.

new settlement in 1800 on a tour of investigation and in 1801 came with his family and effects. The same year seven Montgomery County families arrived. They were three Bechtels, a Kinsey, a Rosenberger and a Biehn. With them were also several unmarried persons, one of whom was George Clemens. It is said that he was the first man to drive a team through the terrible Beverly Swamp between Hamilton and Waterloo. They were ten weeks on the journey, including two weeks that they spent at what is now Hamilton (then "Hornings") while the men made it possible to cross the swamp. In 1802 a number of other families came from Montgomery, Cumberland and other Pennsylvania counties. Later in the same year 1802 came another company among whom was Joseph Bechtel, who as an ordained man became the first Mennonite minister in the colony, and John and Samuel Bricker. The general location of these first families was on the east bank of the Grand River near what is now Preston. A little school was started in 1802 near Blair with one Rittenhouse, as teacher, since the settlement now consisted of at least twenty-five families with a number of children and grown up young people.

These settlers had purchased their lands from Richard Beasley. Their farms were part of Block No. 2 of the Six Nation Indian lands. Mr. Beasley was only joint owner and payment for this land to the Indians, through trustees, was secured by power of mortgage. The titles issued by Beasley were defective because of the existing mortgage. Early in 1803 this defect in the deeds was discovered and the movement to Waterloo immediately stopped. When Mr. Beasley found that his deception was known and that he could not continue to sell the lands to the Mennonites, he agreed to sell 60,000 acres of land, practically the whole of present Waterloo Township, for 10,000 pounds. The matter was taken up by certain Mennonites in Lancaster County, and a company was formed known as "the German Company" and the necessary money was raised. This 60,000 acres was called the German Company Tract. It was divided among the shareholders, by lot, into 134 parcels of 448 acres each. The Company was formed at a meeting held in the home of "Hannes" Eby at Hammercreek near Lititz in Lancaster County. At this meeting it was urged that the harassed brethren in Canada be given assistance, not for the purpose of material gain but as a brotherly act. This spirit of helpfulness, without prospect of personal gain, has ever been an outstanding trait in the life of the Mennonites. The Pennsylvania shareholders now became the possessors of lands in Canada. The first instalment of $20,000 was transported by wagon

from Lancaster, in solid silver cash, in the spring of 1804 and paid over to the proper persons on May 23, 1804. The balance was paid about a year later and clear title was thus given to the lands of the German Company.

During the period of uncertainty relative to the land titles, the immigration to Waterloo was halted. Scarcely any families came during 1803 and 1804. It was during these two years that Markham settlement began. The Beasley difficulty seems to have been the cause. As soon as this difficulty was removed, the settlers came in increasing numbers to Waterloo. Many of those in Pennsylvania, who had so recently come into possession of fertile lands in the Grand River basin, were desirous of locating upon their holdings. The Lancaster families now predominated among the immigrants. During the years 1805, 1806, and 1807, the Mennonite population more than doubled by immigration. Benjamin Eby, who became the leading figure in the young church in Canada, came in 1807. With him came a large number of Lancaster settlers. This stream of settlers continued with vigor until interrupted by the War of 1812 and was not resumed until 1816 after the close of the war.

After the war was concluded the flow of immigrants was renewed. In 1816 the township of North Dumfries, just south of Waterloo Township, and some adjoining territory, was bought by Hon. William Dickson, of Niagara. His agent, Mr. Shade, established himself on the Grand River at the place where the town of Galt now stands. Some Pennsylvania Mennonites settled in the northern part of this township.

Soon after this another Pennsylvania Association was formed which purchased forty-five thousand acres in Woolwich Township just north of the German company tract. The Martin family was the most numerous to settle in this township. They came from West Earl Township in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. Peter Martin, who was the father of seventeen children who married, came to Woolwich in 1819 with his entire family. The next year his cousin, David Martin, also from Lancaster, came to the new settlement. There were twelve children in David Martin's family.

As the number of families in the Waterloo settlement increased they pushed farther back into the newer townships of Blenheim (southwest), Wilmot (west), Wellesley (northwest), Peel (north), Maryborough, Wallace, Howick, and others. In each of these townships well organized churches were established. Regular work is now being carried on by one or another of the Mennon-

ite bodies in all these areas. Smaller groups of Mennonites from the Waterloo District also settled in Ellice, Grey, Culross, Brant, Breenock, and Saugeen Townships in Grey County on Lake Huron, and a small congregation was organized with Solomon Eby as the minister. In all these smaller groups, except Port Elgin, the Mennonite families have either become absorbed in other churches or have moved back into Waterloo County from which they came.

The Zurich Settlement in Huron County

This is another offshoot from the Grand River colony in Waterloo. The Huron Road, leading from Galt and Stratford to Goderick on Lake Huron was opened in 1829. This gave access to this new locality in Huron County. Whether any Mennonites located near Zurich at this time is not known. But it is known that Henry Schuh, a minister from near Berlin, made a preaching tour to Hay and died, while there, early in January, 1837. One would conclude that there were already some Mennonite families here at the time of this trip. During the twenty years following 1850 many Amish and Mennonite families settled in both Hay and Stanley Townships in Huron County. The land is productive, climate is tempered by the lake waters and the locality is a pleasant one. The families are only a few miles from the shore of Lake Huron. However the colony never became larger.

The Markham Settlement

When the Waterloo immigrants found, in the early part of 1803, that their land titles were not valid, the settlement in that county was immediately halted. It was in that year that the first Pennsylvania Mennonites came to York County. Apparently families en route to Waterloo County were diverted to York County. Henry Wideman, a minister, came from Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, to Markham in 1803. Peter Musselman, who also was a minister, came in the same year. It is not known whether he was a minister when he arrived, but it is probable that he was. Nicholas Cober, and his father-in-law, Fisher, from Somerset County, Pennsylvania, had come to Vaughan Township in 1798.[18] Cober was a Lutheran and later became a member of the Brethren in Christ Church. It seems that it was more than a coincidence that the two Pennsylvania families of Wideman and Musselman came to York County in the same year that the Beasley Land difficulty was

[18] See *York County History*, p. 124.

discovered in Waterloo. It is reasonable to believe that these settlers had intended to settle in Waterloo, but rather than take a risk with a faulty land title, they diverted their course to Muddy York (Toronto) and the fertile lands to the north. Yonge Street had been opened about thirty miles north from York before this time. Large areas of land in this county had been granted to United Empire Loyalist soldiers and officers. In Vaughan Township, Captain Lippincott had large holdings. These owners were glad to break up their estates and sell to prospective settlers. Scarcely any of the York County Mennonites received Crown grants but they paid a cash price for their farms. Several are known to have come on horseback and exchanged horse and saddle for a farm and then walked back to their former homes in Pennsylvania.

In 1804 the Christian Reesor family consisting of four married children came to the new settlement. Casper Sherk, brother to the pioneer Joseph Schoerg, who settled on the Grand River in 1800, came to Markham in 1804. Three Huber (Hoover) brothers and the Stouffers came the same year. Abraham Neighswander and his family came about the same time. The Groff (Grove) and Barkey families came a few years later. The Deacon Jacob Schmitt family came to Vaughan soon after the War of 1812. The Ramers were detained at the Niagara River during the War of 1812 and came soon after.

Other family names which are found in the Markham colony are Lehman, Schunk, Burkholder, Stover, Boyer (Byer), Heise, Steckley, Kreider, Strickler, Hare (Herr), Kindy, Eyer, Troyer, Wismer, Oberholtzer, Mishler and Snyder. Some thirty heads of Mennonite families came to this settlement before the year 1826. The Township of Markham received the greater number of them. A few located in Vaughan, Whitchurch, Scarboro and Pickering Townships. The Kreiders, and one family of Hoovers, moved from the Markham settlement to Ohio about 1835. It is probable that the Mackenzie Rebellion of 1837 and the agitation leading to it caused some of these families to again leave their new Canadian homes and return to the United States.

The Church in this colony never was large. There were as many as eight regular places of worship but a few have not been used for some time. The Mennonite Brethren in Christ and Wisler divisions decimated the numbers in this county. Neither of the three sections of the church in this area has enjoyed a very marked prosperity following these schisms. Large numbers of the younger generation have gone into other churches. At the present time the

three bodies are holding the young people of their families fairly well.

The Markham families never occupied the lands of the community compactly. Other nationalities were interspersed in the settlement, chiefly English, Scotch and Irish. As the Mennonite population increased, some of these intervening farms were purchased. The only outside colony that was established from the Markham settlement was near STAYNER. A number of families of Mennonite stock located in Sunnidale and Nottawasaga Townships. The colony there was not large and the main body of the church never built up regular work. The Brethren in Christ and the Mennonite Brethren in Christ churches both, however, have flourishing congregations in this settlement.

THE CHARACTER OF THE EVANGELICAL ANABAPTISTS AS REPORTED BY CONTEMPORARY REFORMATION WRITERS

John Horsch

The Anabaptists were dissenters from both Romanism and the state-church type of Protestantism in the Reformation period, the age of Menno Simons, Martin Luther and Ulrich Zwingli. They have been fitly called the neglected and mistreated step-children of Christendom. Not only has the study of their history been persistently neglected, but until a comparatively recent date scarcely any other writings except those of their opponents and persecutors have been accepted as the sources for the study of their history and doctrine. The results have been of a similar nature as would characterize an attempt to write Protestant church history mainly from Roman Catholic sources. And it may truthfully be said that the Anabaptists were subjected to misrepresentation and slander by their contemporaries to a far greater degree than the Protestantism of the state-church type was by the Catholic Church.

The contemporary theologians and historians of the Catholic Church, as well as of the Protestant state churches, misrepresented the Anabaptists to an almost unbelievable degree. Even the titles of some of their books against them indicate the fierceness of their antagonism. Christopher Andreas Fischer wrote a book, "Of the Anabaptists' Cursed Beginnings." Heinrich Bullinger, the successor of Zwingli in Zurich, gave his first book against the Swiss Brethren the title, "Of the Shameless Wantonness Of the Self-sent Anabaptists." These and many other authors, in fact, the writers of the state churches in general, described the Anabaptists as a sect of fanatics and revolutionists who were dangerous to both the state and to religion. They asserted, for example, that Thomas Münzer, the enthusiast and leader of the rebellious peasants in the Peasants' War in 1525, was (to use the words of Bullinger) "the first and most prominent founder of the Anabaptists"—an absolutely false assertion.

The odium attached to the name "Anabaptist" is illustrated by a verse of Jürgen Wullenweber, of Lübeck, who when he was

unjustly imprisoned, wrote on the wall of his prison, a verse beginning with the couplet,

> Kein Dieb, kein Mörder, kein Wiedertäufer auf Erden
> Bin ich niemals gewest und will's auch nimmer werden.
>
> (No thief, no murderer, no Anabaptist
> I ever was or shall be.)[1]

It was not possible for the Anabaptists to correct even the most flagrant falsifications, because the laws of the German Empire, since 1528, threatened every defender of Anabaptism with death. Menno Simons, in his later years, found it possible, through the favor of Count von Ahlefeld, to set up a small printery of his own at Wüstenfelde in Holstein, but the influence of his books was confined almost entirely to his followers. Needless to say, the place of publication was not given in the books and evidently very few of them came into the hands of the theologians of the dominant churches.

In expressing unwarranted judgment on the Anabaptists, Luther, in his book, *On Anabaptism,* published in 1528, set an example which was often followed by other writers. After saying: "I am not yet sufficiently informed concerning their reasons [for dissenting from state-church Protestantism] and the principles of their faith," he frankly confessed that he was therefore not able to give instruction concerning them. Notwithstanding this admitted lack of information, he denounced them in this book in the severest terms. In a preface to Justus Menius' book, "On the Spirit of the Anabaptists" ("Vom Geist der Wiedertäufer") (1544), Luther made the curious observation that the author of this book had written "so powerful a refutation of Anabaptism that, if a cow had reason, she must say that it is convincing." Menius, in this book defends and demands the persecution of the Anabaptists.

Philip Melanchthon, Luther's most prominent assistant, in the Augsburg Confession, written in 1530 (before the rise of Münsterite Anabaptists), denounced Anabaptism in far severer terms than he used in condemning Romanism. As late as the second half of the last century a prominent German Protestant historian, Dr. Johann Heinrich Kurtz, in a textbook of church history which was widely used in both the German and the English languages, treated the history of the Anabaptists under the caption, "The Deforma-

[1] Until the latter part of the eighteenth century theft was a capital crime in Germany.

tion of the Church," classing them in point of orthodoxy beneath Romanism.

But "truth crushed to earth will rise again." The judgments of men of Luther's time against the Anabaptists are now known to be grossly in error. An American church historian, Vedder, in a work on Anabaptist history, makes this striking statement: "Time which works so many changes, is bringing about the vindication of these greatly wronged people. It is now known and every year sees the fact more generally acknowledged, that they were treated with a cruelty as unjust, unnecessary and unwise as it was brutal. The time is rapidly approaching when the Anabaptists will be as abundantly honored as, in the past four centuries, they have been unjustly condemned."

Before citing the testimony of contemporaries as to the genuine piety of the Anabaptists, it may be desirable to point out the true nature of the Anabaptist movement.

The word Anabaptist means re-baptizer (German *Wiedertäufer*). This name was given to those in the Reformation period who disowned infant baptism as unscriptural, and consequently, when persons who had been baptized in their infancy united with them, baptized them again. The name was a nickname, and was not accepted or owned by any of those to whom it was given.

From this nickname it might be inferred that the Anabaptists ascribed greater virtue to the act of baptism than did those who baptized infants. This was not by any means the case. According to Roman Catholic as well as Lutheran teaching, regeneration is brought about through baptism. Thus, in the language of Menno Simons, an idol was made of baptism.

Again, the practice of infant baptism was the chief cornerstone of state-churchism, such as was in vogue in Protestant as well as in Roman Catholic countries. In each country there was a state church whose rulings and orders were enforced by the civil authorities. By force of the civil law the whole population—both saint and sinner—was compelled to be church members. Dissent was not permitted and was severely punished.

The evangelical Anabaptists saw clearly that this type of church organization, being based on coercion, is not the biblical type. They insisted that a Christian church in the New Testament sense is a body of believers, of "called out" ones, and that the principle of voluntaryism is one of its vital characteristics. They realized that faith cannot be engendered or maintained by the use of

force. Instead of undertaking to compel any one by civil law or persecution to become a church member, the Anabaptists held that membership must be voluntary; they held in fact that only those who have met certain conditions and accepted certain definite obligations are eligible for membership in the church and are fit subjects for baptism.

Contrary to the procedure in the Protestant states where the question of accepting the Protestant creed was decided by the civil authorities for the whole population while the people themselves had no voice in the matter, the Anabaptists insisted that church membership requires the personal, voluntary acceptance of a definite standard of Christian truth and Christian living. So far from compelling unconverted persons to consider themselves church members, they held the practice of scriptural discipline, involving the exclusion of persistent transgressors, to be an essential characteristic of a true Christian church.

It is readily seen that this teaching on the nature of the Church and on baptism cuts the very life nerve of state-churchism. This explains why the rejection of infant baptism was so obnoxious to the leaders of the established national churches which were united with the state. From the point of view of state-churchism the doctrine of the Anabaptists on baptism and on the nature of the Church was an unbearable offense.

In the Reformation period the name Anabaptist was as a rule given to all dissenters from state-churchism. Among the so-called Anabaptists there were various distinct sects. Some of these sects differed vitally and fundamentally from the evangelical Anabaptists, though they agreed with them on disowning infant baptism. Notwithstanding the radical differences among the so-called Anabaptists, it is an obvious fact that a number of Anabaptist sects and groups were in doctrine, principle, and practice so closely related to each other that they may be properly considered as representing one and the same movement. The Swiss Brethren (in Switzerland, South Germany, and Moravia), the Mennonites (in the Netherlands and northwest Germany), the Hutterites (in Moravia), the congregations (in South Germany) in which Pilgram Marbeck was the most prominent minister, and many other Anabaptists in Austria and other provinces, constituted in reality but one movement. These may be designated as the evangelical Anabaptists. The fact is particularly noteworthy that the first, or earliest, of the sects called Anabaptists were the Swiss Brethren (Mennonites).

As just intimated there were, besides the evangelical Anabaptists, certain fanatical and revolutionary sects to whom the Anabaptist name was given. Among these sects the Münsterites alone had a large following, but their history extended over only a few years. These revolutionary sects, with the exception of the followers of David Joris, had a very short history. The evangelical Anabaptists alone survived the persecutions.

For these and other reasons it seems permissible to speak of the Anabaptist movement as referring to the evangelical Anabaptists only, leaving out of consideration the Münsterites and others outside of the ranks of the evangelical Anabaptists. However, the persecutors of the evangelical Anabaptists always insisted that (to speak with Heinrich Bullinger) the history of the Münsterites "indicated what is in reality hidden and concealed behind Anabaptism." Even today there are writers who hold that all the so-called Anabaptists were of one and the same party or movement, and that therefore in the final analysis there is no fundamental difference between the Mennonites and those to whom Menno Simons usually refers as "the corrupt (or immoral) sects."

The Piety and True Christianity of the Anabaptists

As we have previously stated, the Anabaptists were subjected to misrepresentation and fierce slander. Nevertheless, their contemporary opponents, including even their bitterest persecutors, were almost unanimous in the testimony that they led irreproachable lives as concerned their daily walk and conversation. Their antagonists asserted that to ascertain their real character one must look deeper, and would then realize that their piety was only hypocrisy. Those who made this charge evidently never stopped to give consideration to the obvious fact that the willingness to endure cruel persecution and suffer death for the sake of their Christian profession was an irrefutable proof of sincerity.

A striking indirect proof of the sterling character of the Anabaptists on the whole claims our attention in this connection. In the writings of Menno Simons and other Anabaptists the statement is found that it was dangerous to give evidence of a serious purpose to live consistent Christian lives, since those who did so were subject to the suspicion of being Anabaptists, and were in fact given the name Anabaptists. Now, if such statements were found only in the writings of the Anabaptists themselves, they would scarcely deserve more than passing notice. It would in that case be naturally supposed that these statements are probably to be ascribed to

unwarranted generalization. However, the above-stated assertion regarding the danger of being accused of Anabaptist leanings on account of consistent Christian living was made also by a number of contemporary writers who were opponents of the Anabaptists.

A recently published important work containing a great deal of source material for the history of the Anabaptists in the duchy of Württemberg contains many proofs that (after the passing of the Münsterites) the danger of falling under the suspicion of being Anabaptists was very real for those whose lives indicated Christian fervor and consistency, while persons who gave offense by careless or offensive living were never suspected of being Anabaptists.[2] Moreover, this book gives striking evidence that committing sin by any one who was under such suspicion was considered sufficient proof that the person in question was untainted by "Anabaptist heresy," and that the suspicion of having departed from the state-church orthodoxy was groundless. People in general said that he who does not use profanity but lives unoffensively, is an Anabaptist.

Caspar Schwenckfeld wrote: "Those who show a purpose to lead an earnest Christian life, and live piously, are generally considered and accused of being Anabaptists." And again, "I am being maligned, by both preachers and others, as being an Anabaptist, and indeed all who lead a truly devoted Christian life are now almost everywhere given this name." Johann Valentine Andreae (1586-1654), a theologian of a Protestant state-church, wrote, "Whoever seeks now to lead an irreproachable life is called a fanatic, a Schwenckfelder, an Anabaptist." Heinrich Bullinger stated clearly that pious members of the state-church were named Anabaptists. He says: "There are also those who in reality are not Anabaptists but have a pronounced aversion to the sensuality and frivolity of the world, and reprove sin and vice; they are therefore called or misnamed Anabaptists; such should indeed not be molested [by the authorities] in any way."

George Witzel wrote in 1531: "Whoever speaks against the evil customs of the times and urges the need of Christian living must be called an evil Anabaptist; many a one knows not how to clear himself of this suspicion except by engaging in frequent drinking bouts. For your evangelical liberty has resulted in this, that he who earnestly seeks to mend his life, is considered an Anabaptist."

The Swiss Brethren declared that they were despised and persecuted because of manifesting an earnest concern for true Chris-

---

[2] Bossert, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Wiedertäufer*, I.

tian living. They wrote in the booklet *Vindication* (printed as an appendix to Bullinger's larger work on the Anabaptists):

> The ministers of the established church at first, (or before the establishment of the Protestant state church) have taught this evangelical doctrine, and some of them teach it even today, that one should abstain from sin, lead a pious, irreproachable Christian life, be born of God and regenerated, manifest Christian love, follow Christ, bear the cross, fear God and love Him above all things, abide by evangelical truth and forsake home, property, wife, children, etc., rather than to fall away or deny the truth. Indeed, their first evangelical books are full of this teaching, and also the New Testament Scriptures contain an abundance of such testimony. And now, when we by God's grace desire to do, believe, teach, and live, in accord with their first teaching, we are to them an abomination, they can not tolerate us, they defame and reproach us in this our Christian faith, doctrine and life, as if it were heretical and erroneous; they preach against us before the secular authorities and the public in general; they urge and incite them to persecute and kill us. Some of them also advise us to forsake this way and life in order to avoid being driven from our homes. They call us fools for enduring persecution for the sake of truth; yea, whoever among themselves earnestly begins to do and live as he should, they give the same nickname which they give us, namely Anabaptists.

Following are noteworthy expressions concerning the Anabaptists and the Anabaptist movement:

Zwingli, their first and in some respects their foremost opponent, in December, 1524, said that while they erred in judgment, their intentions were good.[3] Later he denied that they had good intentions but nevertheless freely recognized that to the casual observer their lives seemed irreproachable. In his last book against the Swiss Brethren he wrote: "If you investigate their life and conduct, it seems at the first contact, irreproachable, pious, unassuming, attractive, yea, supermundane. Even those who are difficult to please will think their lives excellent."[4] He then denounced their piety as hypocrisy.

Heinrich Bullinger, Zwingli's successor as the head of the state church of the canton of Zurich, says concerning the inception of the Swiss Brethren Church: "Those who joined them were by their ministers received into their church by rebaptism unto repentance and newness of life. They henceforth led their lives under a semblance of a quite spiritual conduct." He says further that they

[3] *Zwinglis Werke,* III, 1914, 378.

[4] Jackson, *Selected Works of Zwingli,* p. 127.

were wont earnestly to rebuke any sin that came to their attention. He had no fault to find on this account; on the contrary, he commended them for it. He says, they were sedate and slow to speak, thus guarding against idle words and levity. "They spoke earnestly against all vain display, against intemperance in eating and drinking, against all profanity and vice."[5]

Johannes Kessler, the contemporary Zwinglian chronicler of St. Gall in Switzerland, wrote: "Their life and conversation was distinguished for its piety, holiness and irreproachableness. They avoided costly attire and despised costly eating and drinking. Their walk and appearance was quite humble. [Contrary to the general custom] they did not carry any weapons for defence. They strongly stressed the need of righteous living."[6] Again Kessler wrote: "Oh, what shall I say about these people! My heart is moved with deep compassion for them. They die gladly and valiantly for the name of Christ, though they are tainted with some error."[7]

Joachim von Watt, called Vadian, the reformer of St. Gall, testified: "None were more inclined toward Anabaptism and more easily entangled with it, than those who were of a pious and upright disposition."[8] In the great debates of Zofingen (1532) and Bern (1538) the ministers of the state-church stated that pious people were especially susceptible to Anabaptist influences. In the last mentioned debate the Zwinglian spokesman stated further that the Anabaptists had withdrawn from the state-church "from a commendable zeal."[9]

Berthold Haller, the Zwinglian reformer of the city and canton of Bern, wrote on September 12, 1532, to Bullinger, concerning the Brethren: "All their followers earnestly guard themselves against sin. They come together frequently and strictly conform to their rules." In other instances also Haller testified that "They shun sin and vice, while the membership of the national church, including even some of those in authority, are lukewarm in these matters." To Martin Bucer, the Zwinglian reformer of Strasburg, Haller wrote on August 24, 1534: "We realize that the best and most sincere people are led astray by the Anabaptists."[10]

---

[5] Bullinger, *Widertoufferen,* fol. 10a.

[6] Kessler, *Sabbata,* 147.

[7] *Ibid.,* 284.

[8] Vadian, *Deutsche historische Schriften,* II, 408.

[9] *Acta, Bern,* 1538, p. 118.

[10] Ottius, *Annalen Anabaptistici,* 55; Strasser, *Der schweizerische Anabaptismus,* 234.

The preachers of the state church of the canton of Bern, assembled in a synod at Zofingen in 1532, admitted in a letter to the Council of Bern that "the Anabaptists have a semblance of outward piety to a far greater degree than we and all the church which in unison with us confess Christ, and they avoid offensive sins which are very common among us."[11]

In his first book against the Brethren, written in 1531, Bullinger says that "the people are running after them as if they were the living saints."[12]

Concerning the early Brethren of Augsburg a contemporary anonymous writer said: "In their brotherhood there was in evidence the purpose to render each other the greatest possible help on the ground of brotherly love."[13]

The leading state church theologians of the duchy of Württemberg said in 1536, in an "opinion" concerning the Brethren: "The majority of those who unite with them do not err from maliciousness but from pure simplicity and commendable zeal which they have toward God, since they see the beautiful appearance of the life of the Anabaptists and also, on the other hand, among the great multitude of our people they see a very wild, shameless, infamous life."[14]

Caspar Schwenckfeld said concerning the Brethren: "Without doubt there are many pious hearts among them who have united with them from no other motive than to do the will of God. I have known and now know many such."

Wolfgang Capito, Martin Bucer's most prominent coworker in the Protestant state church of Strasburg, wrote: "In general the Anabaptists distinguish themselves through an admirable straightforwardness of faith; they abhor error when they recognize it as such." Following is another statement to the point by Capito: "I frankly confess that in most Anabaptists there is in evidence piety and consecration and indeed a zeal which is beyond a suspicion of insincerity. For what earthly advantage could they hope to win by enduring exile, torture and unspeakable punishment of the flesh? . . . I can not notice in them any passion or excitement, and they meet death as confessors of the Christian name not carelessly or wantonly but with due consideration and stupendous endurance."

---

11 McGlothlin, *Berner Täufer.*

12 Bullinger, *Von dem unverschampten fräfel,* fol. 4b.

13 Meyer, C., *Wiedertäufer in Schwaben,* in Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, vol. XVIII, 1897, p. 252.

14 Bossert, *Quellen,* I, 53.

Again Capito wrote: "They are determined to shun the evil life of the world, the sins of gambling, drunkenness, gluttony, adultery, warring, killing, speaking evil of one's neighbor and living in the fleshly lusts, and to flee from that which is in conformity with the flesh and the world."[15]

In a mandate against the Swiss Brethren, published in 1585 by the Council of Bern, it is stated that both among the preachers and the membership of the state church offensive sins and vices are common, "and that is the greatest reason that many pious God-fearing people who seek Christ from their heart are offended and forsake our church (to unite with the Anabaptists)."[16]

Walter Klarer, the chronicler of Appenzell in Switzerland wrote: "Most of the Anabaptists are the very people who at first had been the best with us in promulgating the Word of God."[17]

Katharina Zell, the widow of Matthias Zell, a Zwinglian reformer of Strasburg, addressed an important letter to the clergy of that city concerning the Anabaptists. She wrote:

> You are so passionately enraged against the poor Anabaptists; you pursue them as a hunter who sets the dogs on a wild hog or rabbit; and yet, they confess Christ, the Lord, with us, though in some points they differ from us. Should we for that reason persecute them, and with them Christ whom they so zealously confess and many have confessed despite exile, prison, and death by fire and water? Instead of persecuting them, you should be aware that the fault is on our side, for in doctrine and life we give them occasion to withdraw from us. The authorities should punish those who do evil, but should not undertake to force their faith upon any one. If our government followed your advice, there would be such tyranny that cities and villages would be depopulated. Matthias Zell has never sided with you in this but, at a time when the theologians urged the government to take severe measures, he, with a sad heart and great earnestness, said publicly from the pulpit as well as in a conference of the ministers: I will call God, heaven and earth to witness in that day that I am innocent of the oppression and banishment of these poor people.[18]

A Roman Catholic theologian, Franz Agricola, in a book entitled, *Against the Terrible Errors of the Anabaptists,* written in 1582, says:

"Among the existing heretical sects there is none whose adherents lead in appearance a more modest, better, or more pious

---

[15] Baum, *Capito und Butzer,* 374b; Hulshof, *Doopsgezinden te Straatsburg,* 62, 66.
[16] Muller, *Bernische Täufer,* 88.
[17] Simler, *Sammlung,* I, 824.
[18] Piper, *Zeugen der Wahrheit,* III, 567.

life than the Anabaptists. As concerns their outward public life they are irreproachable. No lying, deception, swearing, strife, harsh language, no intemperate eating and drinking, no outward personal display is found or is discernible among them, but only humility, patience, uprightness, meekness, honesty, temperance, and straightforwardness in such measure that one would suppose that they have the Holy Spirit of God."[19]

Another Roman Catholic author, Christopher Andreas Fischer, wrote:

"They call each other brethren and sisters, they use no profanity nor harsh speech, they do not swear, they do not use weapons and in the beginning they did not even carry knives. They are not intemperate in eating and drinking, they do not wear apparel which indicates worldly show. They do not go to law before the magistrates; they bear everything in patience, as they pretend, and in the Holy Ghost."[20]

Peter Titelman, an inquisitor at Ghent, in the Netherlands, addressing a Mennonite prisoner, in 1556, said concerning the Mennonites: "As regards the life of your people, I admit that you lead a good life and have a good name before all men, and that you are wont to do unto your neighbor as you would have him do unto you, and that you live in peace, love and unity with one another, all of which is very good; and you assist each other in need and distress and lay down your lives for one another, which also is very good, and I cannot say anything against it."[21]

Concerning the life of the Brethren in the Netherlands, Van Benthem, a Dutch author, wrote in 1698: "We may learn much that is good from these people, namely, humility, contentment, moderation, and especially mercy toward the needy. For although the people of the Reformed Church of Holland deserve to be commended for their benevolence toward the poor, yet this virtue is particularly characteristic of these people. Also they are very careful to dress unassumingly."

J. C. Jehring, a historian of East Friesland, wrote in 1720 about the Mennonites of the lower countries: "Their external life and walk are, as is generally known, highly praised by many, and it is verily true that through their good life they attract much attention. They are very friendly and unassuming toward all people. When others owe them money, they will settle in some way rather

19 Rembert, *Wiedertäufer in Jülich,* 564.

20 Fischer, *Von der Widertauffer Verfluchtem Ursprung,* fol. A2b.

21 Van Braght, *Martyrs' Mirror,* Elkhart, Indiana, 1886, 536.

than go to law. One does not hear of them that they use profanity or swearing, or that they quarrel among themselves. And wherever occasion demands, they show a zeal against all immorality."[22]

A Swiss Reformed theologian, George Thormann, in his polemical work of 1693 against the Swiss Brethren, says: "I have indeed found that many of the Anabaptists are quiet, pious people who strive to maintain an inviolate conscience without regard to any danger which they may incur in this endeavor."[23] Johann George Füssli wrote: "They led for the most part a strict life and gave evidences of uncommon piety, as Bullinger himself testifies concerning them."[24]

August Pfeiffer, an early Lutheran theologian, wrote: "He who becomes acquainted with the Anabaptists and Mennonites will find that they seemingly live holy lives. They shun immodesty in dress, swearing, deception, intemperance, immorality, and discord. Judging from their lives, you would suppose that they are all true holy Christians." Another early writer says: "The Mennonites are good, pious, modest people who accept the Holy Scripture by sincere faith and, abounding in good works, seek to fulfil its demands."

Later historians, writing with ample knowledge of the sources confirm the reports of the earlier writers which have been quoted above. The Reformed theologian Dr. Max Göbel, wrote:

> The essential characteristics and distinguishing features of Anabaptism consist in the great stress which they laid upon actual personal conversion through the Holy Ghost, upon entire liberty of conscience and separation of spiritual and worldly things, including the separation of church and state. They endeavored to maintain a true, holy Christian church of the regenerated through a personal covenant of the believers, a church in which all things worldly and sinful, are to be eliminated by Christian discipline and the use of excommunication, and in which the Christian principles of true brotherly love are to be exemplified by liberal giving of both spiritual and material gifts and by a nonresistant, revengeless life. The Anabaptists therefore aimed not only at a reformation of the church as to doctrine and forms of worship (as did the Lutheran reformers), neither did they aim merely at a reformation of ethics, morals and polity (as the Zwinglians and Calvinists) but they aimed above all at a full and thorough realization and application of Christian truth and faith in the heart and walk of every Christian in the whole Christian church.[25]

---

[22] Ten Cate, *Doopsgezinden in Groningen,* II, 147.

[23] Thormann, *Probier-Stein dess Taufferthums,* 10.

[24] Füssli, *Beiträge,* III, 314.

[25] Göbel, *Geschichte des christlichen Lebens in der rheinisch-westphälischen Kirche,* I, 134.

The late Professor Alfred Hegler, of Tuebingen, pointed out the high ideals of the evangelical Anabaptists: "Liberty of conscience, rejection of all state-made Christianity, the demand for personal holiness and a vital personal acceptance of Christian truth." Karl Bauer says: "Their strength lay in the earnestness of their striving for holy living." Dr. Gustav Bossert, a Lutheran church historian, made a similar statement concerning them. Professor Paul Wernle, of the University of Basel, wrote: "Their vital characteristic was the earnestness with which they undertook the practical fulfillment of New Testament requirements both for the individual and for the church."

The church historian, Professor Ernst Staehelin, of the Reformed Church, says: "Anabaptism, by its earnest determination to follow, in life and practice, the primitive Christian Church, has kept alive the truth that he who is in Christ is under obligation to walk in newness of life, and that true Christianity will necessarily encounter the opposition of the world." Professor Walter Koehler of Heidelberg repeatedly refers to the Swiss Brethren as "Bible Christians." The Lutheran historian, Dr. Wilhelm Gussman, speaks of "their rigorous purity of life, their unmovable faithfulness in confessing their faith and suffering for it, and last, not least, the fervent mutual feeling of brotherliness in evidence among them." He states that "they lived and moved in God's Word" and speaks of their earnest endeavor for holiness of life. Abraham Hulshof, a Mennonite historian, author of the standard work on the Anabaptists of Strasburg, wrote: "Their aim and purpose was to constitute a church of true Christians, an assembly whose members were fully determined to order their lives in accordance with the requirements of the Gospel, a voluntary, living church of Christ, consisting of those who truly believed and who, separated from the world, followed Christ in brotherly unison."

In passing it may be observed that these statements concerning the nature of evangelical Anabaptism constitute a forceful, decisive answer to the question whether "the immoral sects" (as Menno Simons designated the Münsterites, Batenburgers and Davidites) were a part of the Evangelical Anabaptist movement.

The history of the Anabaptist movement is one of the great chapters in church history. The movement was great in its doctrines, principles, and ideals, its genuine Christian living, its inherent strength manifested under the most adverse conditions, in the loyalty and devotion of its constituency.

BOOK REVIEWS

Conscription and Conscience: A History, 1916-1919. By John W. Graham, M. A. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1922.

The history of conscientious objection in Great Britain during the last war is given in detail here. Compared with the story of conscientious objection in the United States during the same period, numerous points of difference are revealed. (Three books on the American Conscientious Objector were reviewed in the Mennonite Quarterly Review of July, 1933). As to numbers, there were in proportion to total population ten times as many Conscientious Objectors in England as in America, that is men who refused all forms of army service. It seems that of the distinctly religious objectors in England, Quakers in larger numbers held out against all service than the same group did in the United States. As partial explanation of this fact, it is stated that the Quakers in England are more closely connected with the Socialist Party than in the United States. The proportion of all classes of conscientious objectors who were absolutists seems to have been larger in England also. There were more public men and women of rank and influence who spoke and wrote in behalf of the objectors, some even in Parliament. A very active organization, known as the No-Conscription Fellowship, was influential in uniting the English Conscientious Objectors in a spiritual fellowship, strengthening individual consciences, and keeping before the public mind and before the government the rights of the Conscientious Objectors and the actual or planned abuses against them at the hands of the military. Considerable of the conscientious objection was resistance to the principle of conscription which was then used for the first time in England's history. Political and religious objectors alike objected to conscription as being violation of basic principles of political liberty and individual freedom for which England has long stood. The politico-religious note of the agitation as a whole in England is sounded by Clifford Allen (who wrote the preface to this book) when he remarks: "It is chiefly by the expression of religious impulses through political effort that we may hope to change men's hearts and practice." Such a method of social philosophy does not commend itself to everyone's concept of what is possible. The remark represents a fine ideal but scarcely a realistic program for successful action.

Chapter I is the Introduction, in which the writer presents the viewpoint of the conscientious objector on religion, conscience, conscription, war, and kindred matters. It is a good and carefully reasoned defense of their position, giving due weight to religious and Biblical considerations. Then follow chapters describing the governmental machinery employed for sifting out conscientious objectors and the manner in which it worked. This more often failed to carry out the intent of the Military Service Acts than it succeeded. The methods of the Military in dealing with Conscientious Objectors when they came into their hands are described. The work and activities of Peace Organizations are given in detail. Also the Home Office scheme, and in detail the treatment accorded to the absolutists in prison.

There are statistics as to the numbers. An appendix summarizes the activities of conscientious objectors in other countries than England.

The outstanding impressions one gets from this book are: the program of the English objectors was definite and concrete; the stand they took was not negative, but positive; they were constructively organized, aggressive in propaganda, ready to suffer in protesting against the war system and its ally—conscription.

Goshen College,
Goshen, Indiana.

EDWARD YODER.

Moral Man and Immoral Society, by REINHOLD NIEBUHR. Charles Scribners and Sons, New York. 1932. Pages xxv-284.

The book under review created a considerable stir among social, political, and religious thinkers for a year and more after its appearance. Written by a man who is a professor in the Union Theological Seminary of New York City, himself a socialist and well versed in the accepted lingo of the modern radical schools of thought, this book nevertheless gave a rude jolt to many a complacent modernist by its incisive, penetrating criticism of the popular assumptions which this school commonly postulates in its thinking. The book presents on the whole a dispassionate analysis both of the ideal and of the possibilities for creating a social order in which there is perfect social and economic justice, altruism and mutuality. The general conclusion of the author brings scant comfort to idealists of whatever persuasion, whether they be the modern educationists or the religionists or the sociologists, whether they profess themselves evolutionary or revolutionary socialists, communists, or whatever. Everyone of these classes, although they are themselves severally and nightily convinced that they alone possess the final magic formula for the perfecting of humanity and society, are nevertheless laboring, so it seems, under delusions which are in varying degrees harmless.

The principal thesis of the book may be briefly summarized as follows: Individual persons may attain to a moral and ethical level of conduct toward each other on which mutual love, altruism, personal disinterestedness, forgiveness, even sacrifice and nonresistance are practiced, those moral virtues which satisfy the highest ideals of the individual Christian conscience. The relations between social and national groups, however, cannot be raised to the same lofty ethical level; for human groups are somehow more than an aggregate of individuals; the distinctive vices and shortcomings of individual human beings have a way of compounding themselves in group behavior, while their more spiritual, rational, and ethical characteristics are more or less inhibited in group conduct. So it comes to pass that the group as such is inherently selfish and predatory, and some form and measure of coercion is required for the preservation of order and the restraining of aggression. Every idealistic dogma to the effect that collective human nature can and will be changed for the better through some kind of evolutionary process is designated by the author as a romantic illusion. Consequently he frankly argues for a dualism in mor-

als, one standard to govern the relations of one individual with another, and another standard, a lower one, for the individual as a group member and for inter-group relations. And the latter can never be other than immoral when compared with the best standards of ethics.

The author holds no brief for the doctrine of a gradual and final perfectionism of man and society. Judged from the plane on which his discussion moves, his reasons for claiming that such idealistic hopes are doomed to disappointment seem sane and considerate. It is true that most idealists entertain a romantic overestimate of the goodness of human nature; they fail to recognize the innate limitations of the human mind, imagination, and moral capacity. So, for instance, modern educational philosophy, which dates from the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century, premises the belief in the infinite pliability and remediability of human nature. From this point of view social injustice is synonymous with social ignorance and a growing social intelligence will ultimately eliminate injustice. Rationalists likewise are slow to acknowledge the limitations of the human reason. Man does not live by reason alone, but also by impulse and suggestion.

Religion, even the watery, naturalistic kind which this author has in view, provides some resources for ethical social living. Love places a transcendental value on human life and on personality, thereby discouraging the use of violence in coercing others and mitigating its severity when used. But as a practical moral force love seems limited in its effect to comparatively small and intimate groups. Religious idealists when facing the stubborn reality of group conduct tend to become either defeatists, despairing of improving society at all and withdrawing themselves to an ascetic cultivation of absolute personal values, or sentimentalists who shut their eyes to reality. The ascetic practice of religion, in as much as it focuses attention on the contrast between God's holiness and man's imperfection, comes to regard social injustice between man and man as a very minor consequence. Even the injustices which such persons themselves chance to suffer from cosiety are to them "but light afflictions for a moment" and not giants against which they feel called to take up a crusade.

The morality of nations is vividly characterized as essentially selfish and hypocritical. Love and altruism are not effective on this plane because of the remote contact the nationals of different groups have with each other. Then too, moral individual citizens often sublimate their own selfish instincts into national patriotism and the resulting group selfishness is rationalized variously by means that are hypocritical and self-deceptive. The economic interests of dominant and privileged groups in society are rationalized by themselves in similar hypocritical ways. The unprivileged classes, however, are not without their own ethical and moral shortcomings. But this author does not discover any very glaring or repulsive shortcomings on their part, seemingly, for he passes by even the mention of selfishness and greed as possibly being at the bottom of the proletarian struggle against the dominant group.

While the author postulates the necessity of coercion in social and political activities, and implies that coercion is not consistent with the highest ethical ideals of the individual conscience, he is yet at pains to argue

that coercion is not in itself unethical. Only an immoral motive in the use of coercion can make the latter itself immoral. The distinction seems a dubious one. It is like doing evil that good may come. That the author sensed this himself is evident from the hesitancy with which he would approve the use of coercion, because of the extreme difficulty of keeping it under social control adequate to guarantee that it will not be used wrongly. The corollary contention that there is no essential difference between violent coercion and the so-called non-violent type is well made.

In this book Anabaptists, Mennonites, Dunkers, and Doukobours are cited as groups that have consistently practiced the nonresistance which is implicit in the ideal of religious and ethical perfectionism. Quakers, he insists, have not been consistently nonresistant, for they have generally assumed political responsibility, and politics means coercion of one kind or another, and coercion is not nonresistance. The religious absolutism of the former groups has made them generally disclaim all political responsibility, as the author observes. In the reviewer's opinion, however, this should not imply that they can be classed as defeatists in an ultimate sense. They may be defeatists as they view the meagre resources for moral living that are resident in man and society. Niebuhr's own analysis of these resources goes far to confirm their own estimate of them. But in view of the still greater resources from without they look for the ultimate triumph of right and truth.

Neither can their abstention from political participation be rightly taken as a disclaimer of all social responsibility. Their readiness to contribute to the relief of their suffering and unfortunate fellowmen is well known, as witness their giving of men and means for relief work in the war-stricken areas during and after the Great War. Since they generally belong to the lower middle class economically, being for the most part of small and independent means, their giving to philanthropy is a sharing out of love rather than the dispensing of formal charity, which often has had bad social consequences. Their zeal in Christian propaganda through home and foreign missions, while it has sometimes in their history been dormant, is nevertheless characteristic of most of them. Furthermore, a comparatively large percentage of their number who are educated engage in the work of public school teaching, elementary and secondary, positions in which they contribute greatly to society through the development of good character and good citizenship in the young.

It is true that members of these sects have at times shown marked ascetic tendencies, manifested in a more or less complete withdrawal from contact with society in general. Instead of being a salt of the earth and a light to humanity, some have been content to live for themselves and hide their light under a bushel. In their earnest devotion to transcendent perfectionism they have been frequently unaware of injustices among the generality of men and ignored the evils of organized society. But many have also kept somewhat of a reasonable balance between the two outlooks, aiming at once to be perfect as the Heavenly Father is perfect and acknowledging in a practical way that they are the keepers of their human brothers. The ideal of service to humanity, unselfish and sacrificial, has been a persistent one among them. Their sole method of serving has been by love

and good-will, never by coercion, either political or otherwise, and this service was for them primarily a duty toward God rather than to man. They do not admit that the modern rationalistic, strictly mundane emphasis on technical social betterment is the right corrective to the opposite extremes of a selfish and sometimes hypocritical asceticism or a superficial moral sentimentalism.

Niebuhr himself acknowledges the importance of the social contribution made by just such non-conformists, politically non-co-operating groups who devote their energies to the development of spiritual and moral resources which will influence society at large. Their contribution to society as a whole is indirect but none the less real. The author analyzes correctly when he says: "Nothing is clearer than that a pure religious idealism must issue in a policy of nonresistance which makes no claims to be socially efficacious. It submits to any demands, however unjust, and yields to any demands, however inordinate, rather than assert self-interest against another." Nonresistance, however, while often conceived of as a purely passive attitude, has also a positive phase, that of conquering love, aggressive good-will, the overcoming of evil by means of good. Perhaps it is true that this is efficacious chiefly in personal contacts. It none the less has important results also in remoter relationships.

On the whole the author's discussion is challenging and thought-provoking. His analysis of situations and movements is keen and for the most part realistic. Yet in spite of the sincere effort to be realistic in his viewpoint, he has left aside what evangelical Christians regard as a large and important sector of reality. From the viewpoint of the discussion in the book, supernatural religion is simply non-existent. Even in the survey that is made of the religious resources for moral living in society, supernatural resources are not even mentioned. The entire volume has about it an atmosphere that somehow reminds one of Ecclesiastes, for everything it speaks of seems to be viewed as "under the sun." Naturally those who view human life and the problems of human society *sub specie aeternitatis* see these problems in a different light in many cases. A broader synthesis of the subject including the supernatural would likely not sustain the author's principal conclusions.

Goshen College,
Goshen, Indiana. EDWARD YODER.

Märtyrertheologie und Täuferbewegung, by LIC. THEOL. ETHELBERT STAUFFER, in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,* Dritte Folge III, LII Band, Heft IV, Stuttgart, 1933, pp. 545-598.

The history of martyrdom so characteristically a part of Anabaptist-Mennonite history has rarely been subjected to an analysis. There are descriptive discussions of collections of martyrs' records, in which discussions the authenticity of the documentations found in martyr stories and hymns is ascertained from official court files. Such productions were and still are of importance since the martyr story was and is occasionally the only source of Anabaptist history, the genuine portion of which truly is a history of martyrdom. Recent investigations into Swiss, Dutch and Ger-

man-Austrian archives certify the reliability of the subjective reports in the *Martelaerspiegel,* the *Ausbund* hymnbook, the *Lieder der Hutterischen Brüder,* the *Geschichtbuch* of the Hutterites, and in other original Anabaptist sources.

To the historical verification and analysis and the superficial interpretation given to Anabaptist martyr-records by socialist writers, Professor Stauffer, to my knowledge, has added an entirely new type of study in devoting it to a method of historical theology. He has developed his problem from four different angles: (1) Showing the traditional Jewish-Christian trend of what he calls "martyr-theology" (pp. 545-560). (2) Pointing out the "manifest destiny" of martyrdom characteristic of the true church of God (560-574). (3) Proving that apocalyptic interpretation of the fate of persecution has also been current in the Anabaptist group (574-583). (4) Describing the significance in Anabaptist martyr theology of adult baptism, the Anabaptist confession of faith and the principle of nonresistance (583-598).

Since the Anabaptist phase in the experience of martyrdom is here pictured as the same bloodstream of testimony beginning in early Jewish history, flowing from the Cross of Jesus into primitive Christianity, the early church, *etc.,* Professor Stauffer sheds much light on the customary kind of an all-embracing treatment or martyrdom found in nearly all Anabaptist documents. *Civitas dei* overcomes *civitas diaboli*—the eternal goal and victory of the martyred, their challenge to the worldly oppressors and persecutors and the source of stimulation of the present and future church. Sociologically, however, the martyr emphasis is contracted at certain intervals in the history of the church. Constantine's state church, the church of the pope, the territorial and princely churches of the reformation ceased to be "martyr-churches." It was the Anabaptist-Mennonite group which inherited the long tradition of martyr-suffering to its fullest extent. Luther's initial enthusiasm, his readiness for sharing the death of his early followers, is clearly of the later Anabaptist pattern. An interesting synopsis (p. 536) shows the literary influence of his martyr hymns on portions in the Anabaptist *Ausbund,* etc. In the opinion of Professor Stauffer the period of persecutions, that is the great period of the Anabaptist "Märtyrer-Apocalypse," reaches to the time when the Dutch States General intervened for the oppressed Swiss Brethren around 1700. This observation (p. 559) invites possible objections. For instance, the Hutterian Brethren certainly continued to be visited by great persecution and suffering after that date. The interpretation of these experiences (which include the death of Hutterian conscientious objectors of the Elmspring, South Dakota, community during the World War) would possibly add a valuable point to the discussion. Similarly, the fate of the Mennonites in Russia during war and revolution found a religious interpretation. How would it compare with the original Anabaptist "martyr-theology"?

The second section of Professor Stauffer's study stresses the fact that from the very beginning the Anabaptists follow a Christo-centric outlook. The Son of God is the leader of all the persecuted. They give him the same attributes, *"Schwärmer und Landläufer,"* as they themselves were called by the authorities. His death they sometimes describe as that of an heretic.

Yet the unique significance of Christ who died for our sins continues to stand out in their literature. One has to conform with the sufferings of the Lord. His cross is our cross. Through it divine truth will stay victorious. (564, 566, 572, 574). A somewhat artificial impression is made by a footnote remark (563) according to which the reference of an *Ausbund* hymn to a road covered with snakes is to suggest, in the opinion of Prof. Stauffer, the union of the *"Geist der Märtyrerapokalyptik . . . mit dem Geist des germanischen Heldenmythos."* The legend of the horseman of Hornhausen is quoted. As a hint one could accept it but not in this positive manner—where the rhyme to *"gegangen"* calling for *"Schlangen"* would offer just as good an explanation. A great deal more proof of Teutonic myth in Anabaptist hymns would need to be assembled before conclusions of that nature would be justified.

The third section brings out very impressively the apocalyptic interpretation of the persecution experience among the Anabaptists. God's revelations are absolutely real; they are historical realities to them. Jakob Huter and Menno Simons are quoted in their views on how the authorities, powerful as they may be, were blinded now but will soon have to face God's truth which they will vainly suppress through fire and sword.

In the fourth section Professor Stauffer presents remarkable reflections on the meaning of baptism, confession of faith and nonresistance in relation to martyrdom. He does not, however, list and analyse the various reasons which led to torture and death. In the spirit of this study theological relationships are made the background and foreground of the martyr experience. The steadfastness of the persecuted in sticking to their belief unto death transformed their principles into a symbolic language. Baptism becomes baptism through blood. Conrad Grebel wrote that Christians will have to experience baptism in suffering and death (583ff). Rebaptism means taking the oath of fealty to Christ for whom they are ready to die (587).

Historians of the Anabaptist-Mennonite movement will be interested in the emphasis the author places on the fact that the original articles of faith of the Brethren were martyr-confessions. As they presented their articles of faith they pronounced thereby, as it were, word for word the death sentence that fell upon them. Although in the mind of public authorities the Anabaptist objections to state laws were sufficient ground for putting them to death, the Anabaptist communities took it as a trial of their confession. Martyrdom furnished the test of their belief. It is in this discussion that Professor Stauffer unintentionally backs up the well-known argument of John Horsch in stating: "They (the Anabaptists) established dogmatic norms and limitations in the confessional belief of their communities and did not shrink from excommunicating" (588). While the papal and the state church established a legal set of articles of faith and compelled acceptance of them by force, the Anabaptists and Mennonites on the other hand were ready to testify to their religious convictions at the stake.

The principle of nonresistance, the utter rejection of any assumption of and participation in political authority, the Anabaptist acceptance of suffering for the sake of Christ's command, brought forth a martyr type

which, from the very beginning, excluded the militant character. Concluding his study Professor Stauffer introduces as a unique exception the case of Balthasar Hubmaier. This man of the sword was, it appears, no less a martyr to the cause. Professor Stauffer goes even further and elects him patron of the Central European Mennonites who, during the nineteenth century, compromised with their respective governments concerning military service. In reality Hubmaier's position in the Anabaptist movement never conformed to its genuine characteristics. His changing personality, his violent temperament which found its earliest known expression in the anti-semitism he agitated for his own benefit in Regensburg in 1519—such and other events in his later career separate Hubmaier distinctly from the original Anabaptist leaders. Even though he became the most effective defender of the principle of adult baptism in the South and would not surrender this very point to the emperor who put him to the stake it requires some modification to place Hubmaier alongside Felix Manz, Michael Sattler and the rest. Our author is, of course, aware of all that. His interpretation of Hubmaier is indeed a very suggestive one for the historian who is to rewrite this period on the basis of new material coming from the publication of the *Täuferakten* now in process. Professor Stauffer's final paragraph, where he steps out in his treatise in historical martyr-theology to fasten on recent Mennonite history the militant principles of Hubmaier, will lead the student of nineteenth century and later developments among the Mennonites to study the causes of the decline of the martyr spirit. Their ancient challenge changed into a readiness for compromise. It is (among the European Mennonites) here where, from a merely scientific point of view, sociology enters, calling for an investigation into both parties involved in the "martyr-issue."

American University,
Washington, D. C. ERNST CORRELL.